

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 4. This is responsive to the Advisory Action which stated that the results are not commensurate in scope with the claimed invention since the broad claims do not have any numerical limitation of the catalyst.

There is also submitted herewith a Rule 132 Declaration executed by Mr. Toshinobu Yoshihara. The Declaration sets forth the experimental comparison described in the Applicants' Response dated December 21, 2005, which is responsive to the Advisory Action which stated that the results are not in the form of a sworn affidavit.


The experimental comparison clearly demonstrates that the combination of catalyst according to the claimed invention produces a remarkably shorter reaction time than the reaction time required when using the individual catalyst. Such unexpectedly reduced reaction time of the claimed method is not obvious from the cited prior art.

In view of the foregoing, the former rejection of claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 under 35 USC 103 as unpatentable over Ichikawa is respectfully traversed as applied to the amended claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Takatsugu TAKAMURA et al.

By: 
Warren M. Cheek, Jr.
Registration No. 33,367
Attorney for Applicants

WMC/dlk
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
July 20, 2006